UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

T-9

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,561	11/21/2003	Hiroshi Murayama	245872US2SRD	8460

22850 7590 01/11/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
MORRISON, JAY A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,561	MURAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,6-9,11,12,14,16-19,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,6-9,11,12,14,16-19,21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1,2,4,6-9,11,12,14,16-19,21 and 22 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. As per claim 6, lines 1-2: "the apparatus according to claim 5" should be "the apparatus according to claim 1".

b. As per claim 16, lines 1-2: "the method according to claim 15" should be "the method according to claim 11".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1,7,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the first typical property set" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the typical property set".

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said storage" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "said typical property database".

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the first typical property set" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the typical property set".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-2,6,11-12,16,21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riley et al. ('Riley' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,663,788) in view of Chakrabarti et al. ('Chakrabarti' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,356,899).

As per claim 1, Riley teaches

A database management apparatus which manages a database of industrial products having a hierarchical classification structure in which a lower classification inherits a property of an upper classification that defines a plurality of properties, comprising: (see background and abstract)

a setting unit configured to set a typical property set including at least one property of a first classification of the industrial products as a typical property that represents the first classification, wherein the first typical property set is inherited by a second classification lower than the first classification; (top level generic and lower levels inherits, column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 22)

a typical property database which stores the typical property set in association with the hierarchical classification structure; (generic descriptions stored in database in hierarchical tree, column 6, lines 21-30)

and a display having a screen on which a plurality of typical properties in the typical property set stored in the typical property database are displayed in a display order inherited by the second classification together with the typical property set. (generic process, column 13, lines 38-48; figure 18)

Riley does not explicitly indicate "and extrinsic information that includes a query condition for the typical property".

However, Chakrabarti discloses "and extrinsic information that includes a query condition for the typical property" (query derived from the local and inherited attributes, column 7, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Riley and Chakrabarti because using the steps of "and extrinsic information that includes a query condition for the typical property" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by expanding the initial set with related information elements. This gives the user the advantage of having more reuse through hierarchy and inheritance.

As per claim 2, Riley teaches

the typical property set is independent of another typical property set, and an identical property is allowed to belong to both of the typical property set and the another typical property set. (column 12, lines 11-40)

As per claim 6, Riley teaches

the display order is allowed to be re-ordered. (column 14, lines 14-20)

As per claims 11-12

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 16,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 21, Riley teaches

the query condition in the typical property set of the first classification is inherited by the second classification. (input/output descriptions, column 7, lines 10-13)

As per claim 22, Riley teaches

the typical property set of the first classification is inherited by the second classification independently with respect to an inheritance mechanism of the hierarchical classification structure. (column 7, lines 5-15)

7. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riley et al. ('Riley' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,663,788) in view of Chakrabarti et al. ('Chakrabarti' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,356,899) and further in view of Bohrer et al. ('Bohrer' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,106,569).

As per claim 4,

Neither Riley nor Chakrabarti disclose "the setting unit further sets negative inheritance to the typical property in the typical property set so that the property fails to be inherited by the second classification"

However, Bohrer discloses "the setting unit further sets negative inheritance to the typical property in the typical property set so that the property fails to be inherited by the second classification" (column 2, lines 55-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Riley, Chakrabarti and Bohrer because using the steps of "the setting unit further sets negative inheritance to the typical property in the typical property set so that the property fails to be inherited by the second classification" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing an object to inherit part of its behavior from another object. This gives the user the advantage of not having to inherit all of the behavior or properties from another object.

As per claim 14,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected.

8. Claims 7-9 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riley et al. ('Riley' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,663,788) in view of Chakrabarti et

al. ('Chakrabarti' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,356,899) and further in view of Okumura et al. ('Okumura' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,178,424).

As per claim 7,

Neither Riley nor Chakrabarti disclose "a registry to register a first user and a second user, and wherein said storage stores a first typical property set to be used by the first user and stores a second typical property set to be used by the second user."

However, Okumura discloses "a registry to register a first user and a second user, and wherein said storage stores a first typical property set to be used by the first user and stores a second typical property set to be used by the second user" (column 6, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Riley, Chakrabarti and Okumura because using the steps of "a registry to register a first user and a second user, and wherein said storage stores a first typical property set to be used by the first user and stores a second typical property set to be used by the second user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing ordinary users to have the correct information stored without much knowledge. This gives the user the advantage of not having to set every attribute or property.

As per claim 8,

Neither Riley nor Chakrabarti disclose "the registry registers a network address of the first user to which a message indicative of registration of a new instance which

satisfies a query condition for a typical property of the first typical property set is transmitted."

However, Okumura discloses "the registry registers a network address of the first user to which a message indicative of registration of a new instance which satisfies a query condition for a typical property of the first typical property set is transmitted" (location, column 5, lines 37-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Riley, Chakrabarti and Okumura because using the steps of "the registry registers a network address of the first user to which a message indicative of registration of a new instance which satisfies a query condition for a typical property of the first typical property set is transmitted" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by tracking information in a distributed information system. This gives the user the advantage of having the ability to identify locations within the system.

As per claim 9,

Neither Riley nor Chakrabarti disclose "the registry registers the network address of the first user further informed of a Universal Resource Identifier (URI) of the new instance."

However, Okumura discloses "the registry registers the network address of the first user further informed of a Universal Resource Identifier (URI) of the new instance" (column 5, lines 37-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Riley, Chakrabarti and Okumura because using the steps of "the registry registers the network address of the first user further informed of a Universal Resource Identifier (URI) of the new instance" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by tracking information in a distributed information system. This gives the user the advantage of having the ability to identify locations within the system.

As per claims 17-19,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 7-9 and are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to Applicant's argument that Riley does not disclose "a setting unit configured to set a typical property set including at least one property of a first classification", "wherein the first typical property set is inherited by a second classification lower than the first classification", it is noted that Riley discloses generic property descriptions (column 6, lines 21-23), which are inherited by the lower level (column 7, lines 4-15). Therefore Riley discloses the limitation.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 regarding Riley not describing setting extrinsic information that includes a query condition for the typical

property, they have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100